

REMARKS

Claims 1, 9, 10, 12, 15-17 and 23 are amended. Claims 8 and 11 are canceled. Claims 29 and 30 are new. Claims 1-7, 9, 10, 12-30 remain in the application. In view of the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application.

Claim Objections

Claims 8 and 11 are objected to because they depend from claim "0". These claims have been canceled. Therefore, for at least this reason, these claim objections are now moot.

§ 101 Rejections

Claims 1-7 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101. In this regard, the Office argues that these claims “do not provide tangible results”. Applicant respectfully disagrees and submits that these claims and the specification are replete with tangible results. Nevertheless, in the interest of advancing the prosecution of this matter, Applicant has made clarifying amendments that the Office has agreed will result in these rejections be withdrawn. Therefore, for at least this reason, these claims are allowable.

The § 102(a) rejections based on Isaacs

Claims 1-3 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,832,245 to Isaacs et al. (hereinafter “Isaacs”).

Claim 1, as amended [added language in bold italics], recites a method comprising:

- 1 identifying components associated with a first end point in an
2 environment;
- 3 identifying components associated with a second end point in the
4 environment;
- 5 determining whether any of the identified components are associated
6 with both the first end point and the second end point;
- 7 identifying relationships between the first end point, the second end
8 point, and any components associated with both the first end point
and the second end point; *and*
- 9 *displaying the relationships by, in part, displaying a social context
associated with the first end point and a second context associated
with the second end point.*

10 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that Isaacs
11 discloses all the subject matter of this claim. Applicant respectfully disagrees
12 and submits that Isaacs fails to disclose all the claimed subject matter. For
13 instance, Isaacs fails to disclose identifying components associated with a first end
14 point and with *a second end point* because, at best, the contacts in Isaacs are only
15 associated with a first end point – that being the user. As such, Isaacs could not
16 possibly disclose “determining whether any of the identified components are
17 associated with both the first end point and the second end point”.

18 Nevertheless, in the interest of advancing the prosecution of this matter,
19 Applicant has amended this claim to recite “displaying the relationships by, in
20 part, displaying a social context associated with the first end point and a second
21 context associated with the second end point.” This subject matter is clearly
22 missing from Isaacs. The Office has recognized this, stating “Isaacs further in
23 view of Martino do not explicitly teach wherein displaying relationships includes
24 displaying a social context associated with the first end point and displaying a
25 social context associated with the second end point.” (Office Action, Page 12).

1 Furthermore, in this regard, the Office's reliance on Fig. 4 of Nevin for disclosing
2 this subject matter is misplaced because this figure merely shows information
3 entered for *a single user* ("Rocky"). (see Fig. 4 and Paragraph [0249] of Nevin).
4 As such, this feature is clearly missing from Nevin as well.

5 Isaacs fails to disclose all the subject matter of this claim. Accordingly,
6 for at least this reason, this claim is allowable.

7 Claims 2-3 and 15 depend from claim 1 and are allowable as depending
8 from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own
9 recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 1, are not
10 disclosed in Isaacs.

11

12 **The § 102(a) rejections based on Martino**

13 Claims 16, 18, 22-23 and 27-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as
14 being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,486,897 to Martino et al. (hereinafter
15 "Martino").

16 Claim 16, as amended [added language in bold italics], recites a method
17 comprising:

18

- 19 • displaying a first end point;
- 20 • displaying components associated with the first end point;
- 21 • displaying a second end point;
- 22 • displaying components associated with the second end point;
- 23 • displaying a common component associated with the first end point
and the second end point;
- 24 • displaying a link between the common component and the first end
point; and
- 25 • displaying a link between the common component and the second
end point; *and*

1 • *determining a path strength associated with the common*
2 *component by, at least in part,:*

3 ○ *determining a first link strength for the link between the*
4 *common component and the first end point;*
5 ○ *determining a second link strength for the link between the*
6 *common component and the second end point; and*
7 ○ *calculating the path strength based at least in part on the*
8 *first link strength and the second link strength.*

9
10
11 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that Martino
12 discloses all the subject matter of this claim. Applicant respectfully disagrees
13 and submits that Martino fails to disclose all the claimed subject matter. For
14 instance, Martino fails to disclose displaying a second end point because the
15 display in Fig. 5 of Martino displays a single end point – that being the reference
16 node I7 301.

17 Nevertheless, in the interest of advancing the prosecution of this matter,
18 Applicant has amended this claim to recite “determining a path strength associated
19 with the common component by, at least in part, determining a first link
20 strength...determining a second link strength...calculating the path strength based
21 at least in part on the first link strength and the second link strength.” This subject
22 matter is clearly missing from Martino.

23 Martino fails to disclose all the subject matter of this claim. Accordingly,
24 for at least this reason, this claim is allowable.

25 Claims 18 and 22 depend from claim 16 and are allowable as depending
26 from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own
27 recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 16, are not
28 disclosed in Martino.

1 Claim 23, as amended [added language in bold italics], recites one or more
2 computer-readable *storage* media having stored thereon a computer program that,
3 when executed by one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to:

4

- 5 • display a first end point in a social network *and a social context*
6 *associated with the first end point*;
- 7 • display a second end point in a social network *and a social context*
8 *associated with the second end point*;
- 9 • identify a common component associated with the first end point and
10 the second end point;
- 11 • display the common component associated with the first end point
12 and the second end point;
- 13 • display a link between the common component and the first end
14 point; and
- 15 • display a link between the common component and the second end
16 point.

17 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that Martino
18 discloses all the subject matter of this claim. Applicant respectfully disagrees
19 and submits that Martino fails to disclose all the claimed subject matter. For
20 instance, Martino fails to disclose displaying a second end point because the
21 display in Fig. 5 of Martino displays a single end point – that being the reference
22 node I7 301.

23 Nevertheless, in the interest of advancing the prosecution of this matter,
24 Applicant has amended this claim to recite to display “...a social context
25 associated with the first end point” and “...a social context associated with the
26 second end point”. This subject matter is clearly missing from Martino.

27 Martino fails to disclose all the subject matter of this claim. Accordingly,
28 for at least this reason, this claim is allowable.

1 Claims 27 and 28 depend from claim 23 and are allowable as depending
2 from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own
3 recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 23, are not
4 disclosed in Martino.

5

6 **The § 103(a) rejections based on Isaacs and Martino**

7 Claims 4-5, 7-10 and 12-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as
8 being unpatentable over Isaacs in view of Martino.

9 Claims 4-5, 7, 9, 10 and 12-14 depend from claim 1. In making out the
10 rejection of these claims, the Office argues Isaacs and Martino teach or suggest all
11 of the subject matter of these claims and that it would have been obvious to
12 combine their teachings.

13 Applicant respectfully disagrees. As noted above, Isaacs fails to disclose
14 all the subject matter of claim 1, including “displaying the relationships, wherein
15 displaying the relationships includes displaying a social context associated with
16 the first end point and displaying a social context associated with the second end
17 point.” Furthermore, Martino fails to remedy this deficiency. As such, Isaacs and
18 Martino cannot be said to teach or suggest all of the subject matter of these
19 dependant claims, either singly or in combination. Accordingly, for at least this
20 reason, these claims are allowable.

21 Claim 8 is Canceled.

The § 103(a) rejections based on Isaacs, Martino and Nevin

Claims 6 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Isaacs in view of Martino and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0086238 to Nevin, III (hereinafter “Nevin”).

Claim 6 depends from claim 1. In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues Isaacs, Martino and Nevin teach or suggest all of the subject matter of this claim and that it would have been obvious to combine their teachings.

Applicant respectfully disagrees. As noted above, Isaacs fails to disclose all the subject matter of claim 1, including “displaying the relationships, wherein displaying the relationships includes displaying a social context associated with the first end point and displaying a social context associated with the second end point.” Furthermore, as noted above, Martino and Nevin fail to remedy this deficiency. As such, Isaacs, Martino and Nevin cannot be said to teach or suggest all of the subject matter of dependant claim 6, either singly or in combination. Accordingly, for at least this reason, this claim is allowable.

Claim 11 is Canceled.

The § 103(a) rejections based on Martino and Nevin

Claims 17, 19-21 and 24-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martino in view of Nevin.

Claims 17 and 19-21 depend from claim 16. In making out the rejection of these claims, the Office argues Martino and Nevin teach or suggest all of the subject matter of these claims and that it would have been obvious to combine their teachings.

1 Applicant respectfully disagrees. As noted above, Martino fails to disclose
2 all the subject matter of claim 16, including “determining a path strength
3 associated with the common component, wherein determining a path strength
4 comprises... determining a first link strength...determining a second link
5 strength...calculating the path strength based at least in part on the first link
6 strength and the second link strength.” Furthermore, Nevin fails to remedy this
7 deficiency. As such, Martino and Nevin cannot be said to teach or suggest all of
8 the subject matter of these dependant claims, either singly or in combination.
9 Accordingly, for at least this reason, these claims are allowable.

10 Claims 24-26 depend from claim 23. In making out the rejection of these
11 claims, the Office argues Martino and Nevin teach or suggest all of the subject
12 matter of these claims and that it would have been obvious to combine their
13 teachings.

14 Applicant respectfully disagrees. As noted above, Martino fails to disclose
15 all the subject matter of claim 23, including to display “...a social context
16 associated with the first end point” and “...a social context associated with the
17 second end point”. Furthermore, Nevin fails to remedy this deficiency. As such,
18 Martino and Nevin cannot be said to teach or suggest all of the subject matter of
19 these dependant claims, either singly or in combination. Accordingly, for at least
20 this reason, these claims are allowable.

21

22

23

24

25

1 **Conclusion**

2 All of the claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant
3 requests a Notice of Allowability be issued forthwith. If the Office's next
4 anticipated action is to be anything other than issuance of a Notice of Allowability,
5 Applicant respectfully requests a telephone call from the Examiner.

6
7
8 Dated: 6/4/2007

9
10 Respectfully Submitted,

11 By:

12 Rich Bucher
13 Reg. No. 57,971
14 (509) 324-9256

